



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Book Reviews.

Encyclopædia Biblica: A Critical Dictionary of the Literary, Political, and Religious History, the Archæology, Geography, and Natural History of the Bible. Edited by PROFESSOR T. K. CHEYNE, D.D., and MR. J. SUTHERLAND BLACK, LL.D. Vol. III, L-P. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1902. Cols. 2689-3988. \$5.

The previous volumes of this great work on the Bible have been duly reviewed,¹ and its characteristics have become generally known. By reason of Professor Cheyne's editorship, and his extensive contributions on Old Testament subjects, as well as because of the elaborate articles of Professor Schmiedel in the New Testament field, the *Encyclopædia Biblica* has obtained a reputation for radicalism and subjectivity which does injustice to the major portion of its contents. The work in the main represents the highest scholarship of the advanced type, and is of very great value for professional Bible students. Not a few of its longer articles are superior to those upon the same topics in any other Bible dictionary. It cannot be denied, however, that the point of view of the *Encyclopædia Biblica* is excessively critical, and that it fails on the whole either to do justice to conservative views or to form a bridge by which one may pass to different views. The interpretation and the hypotheses are those of the advanced school, rather than representative of a consensus of opinion among the whole body of true scholars. The general position of the work cannot be called either moderate or mediating; at the same time, it no doubt in many respects marks the way along which conservative interpretation will move, and therefore can be of great assistance to those who are prepared by study and training to use the *Encyclopædia* wisely. So far, however, as the remarkable vagaries of Professor Cheyne, Professor Schmiedel, Professor van Manen, and certain others are concerned, one may well believe that they will pass as eccentric by-products of scholarship.

As has been the case in the earlier volumes, this one also is devoted mainly to the Old Testament. The space, the strength, and the inter-

¹ For the review of Vol. I, see the *Biblical World* for April, 1900, pp. 297-310; for the review of Vol. II, the issue of July, 1901, pp. 67-71.

est have been given to that portion of the Bible. There are New Testament articles, but the longest ones are very unsatisfactory, and most of the topics are treated with undue brevity. It is evident that the editor still adheres to the position which he announced in the preface to the work, that the present literary and historical criticism of the New Testament is so backward and defective that it does not deserve a large amount of recognition. This attitude has been determinative for the *Encyclopædia* as regards the articles upon topics which belong exclusively to the New Testament field. The chief value of the work is for Old Testament study; for the study of the New Testament it cannot be said to be of primary importance.

Biblical History and Archæology.—The article on "Names" occupies nearly thirty pages and is the joint product of Nöldeke who writes on "personal names," of G. B. Gray, on "place names," and of E. Kautzsch, on "divine names," with the usual additions and emendations of the editor. An abounding wealth of material is furnished. The demand for text-criticism in dealing with names is of course much greater than is felt elsewhere and the readiness of the writers for this *Encyclopædia* to resort to corrections, while manifest here, is much more justifiable than is the case when different material is in hand. Important special discussions are those on the value of names for the study of Hebrew religion, on the names Yahwe and Elohim, on the idea of God as father in the Old Testament, and on plurals and duals in place names.

In "Mercy Seat," Deissmann rejects the signification "covering" for *Kapporeth* and decides for "instrument of propitiation;" he holds that the same meaning must be given to the Greek *ἱλαστήριον* which cannot be limited to "propitiatory sacrifice" only. His conclusion as to its meaning in Rom. 3 : 25 is that not a propitiatory sacrifice is referred to, but fellowship with Christ by blood-communion whereby he is our continual propitiation.

Bertholet rewrites W. Robertson Smith's articles on "Priest" and "Levites." He connects the early Hebrew priest with the Arabian rather than with the Canaanite conception. The priest is guardian of a temple and an oracle rather than offerer of sacrifices; only gradually do ritual activities come to take the first place in his work and turn him into a sacrificer and an organizer of ritual law. The Levites are acknowledged to come from an original Hebrew tribe, which early suffered some mysterious disaster the survivors of which appear as ministers of shrines. The name was extended in time to cover all such

persons, made equivalent to priests. The usual explanation of the gradual separation of the two terms is given.

A radical outcome to the article on "Moses" is to be expected when we find that Dr. Cheyne has taken it in hand. All his special views, like those concerning the north-Arabian Musri, Jerahmeel, and Cushan, have full play. The outcome is negative and indefinite. "If it was not an exodus from an Egyptian 'house of servants' that awakened the sense of an almighty and all-righteous protector of Israel, and if it was not through Moses that the meaning of the event was brought home to the people, what other deliverance and what other deliverer are we to set in their place?" From this we are inclined to conclude that, in spite of the stripping off of much religious and political distinction conferred on Moses by the tradition, he is yet historical because Israel's later political and religious life demands him.

Francis Brown and the late Professor Tiele collaborate on the article "Persia." The former discusses the name as it appears in the Old Testament and assigns it to the Greek period. Tiele writes the historical part with accuracy and clearness. He does not seem to us to deal with the early Medo-Persian period in so thorough a way as is desirable. The Ummanmanda, according to him, cannot have been Medes; they were (probably) Scythians. Yet the difficulties of this position are acknowledged. We must await further light before coming to definite conclusions. A fuller treatment of the relations of Persia to its provinces as illuminative of the post-exilic community would have been a great boon to the student and is the only serious lack in the article.

"Law and Justice" is an orderly and lucid discussion of the growth of tribal custom into law, to be modified in various ways by the settlement of a population in a given country. These laws, at first mere customs, were embodied in writing, and alongside the main codes were other oral laws that finally were put into written form. The administration of these laws was also provided for on quite an elaborate scale. The results of court procedure often resulted in punishment of some transgressor of the law. Provisions were amply made for all such criminals, though details are usually meager. One of the most interesting sections of Jewish law was that pertaining to personal rights, regarding family, slaves, land, buying and selling, compensations for damages, and inheritance. Occasional references to the present-day customs among the Arabs and to those among contemporaneous peoples illumine the article.

"Marriage" is a well-proportioned article on all the chief phases of the problem in Hebrew times. Beginning with the betrothal, the author carries the discussion down through marriage festivities, polygamy, divorce, widows, and the levirate marriage. The entire treatment is based on the supposition that the current analysis of the Pentateuch is a fact, and the material is so arranged. The biblical facts furnish about all the matter employed in this article, though references to outside customs show that the author had at his command a wide range of illustrative contemporaneous customs.

"Mourning Customs" is a brief—an all too brief—presentation of the biblical facts. Aside from the recital of biblical references, the author devotes more than half his space to the discussion of the origin of those customs. Here he presents points made by W. R. Smith, Schwally, and Frazer, and refers to other articles for the discussion of special phases of the theme, such as "Cuttings," "Lamentations," etc.

"New Moon" is also a short article, as its treatment was given in part under the article "Feasts." Recourse is had here to the investigations of Lagarde and Wellhausen, in addition to the meager Scripture passages on the theme. Though the festival of the "New Moon" assumed some real importance in the times of Saul and David, surprise is expressed that there is no mention of it either in the "book of the covenant" or in the Deuteronomic law. The explanation given by Wellhausen is that such omission was due to the fact that the lunar festivals came into rivalry with Yahwe-worship. If such was the purpose of the writers, it failed to succeed, for there are numerous later references to the observance and regulation of this festival.

"Passover" enters into the question with some fulness. After designating the Harvest festival, that of Unleavened Bread, and the offering which attended this feast, the author conjectures that the *Massôth* festival was of Canaanitish origin, while he acknowledges at the same time (col. 3592) that there is "no direct evidence of the existence among the Canaanites of any such spring festival; but a thanksgiving harvest festival is attested in Judg. 9:27." At the time "there were two adjacent festivals: (1) a popular *hag*, the feast of the *Massôth*, at which also the firstlings of cattle were offered, and (2) a sacrifice celebrated within the family circle, the *pêsah*, at which the sacrificial victim was slain with a specially solemn ritual" (col. 3597). These feasts were finally united, and the offering of the first-born was made in connection with the *pêsah*. This represents in part the process on the author's plan by which the Passover feast of later days

grew up. It was the result of the amalgamation of several observances which fell in the early springtime, and the steps in this process are those discovered in the various documents out of which the Pentateuch was composed.

"Pentecost" has had its main thesis discussed under "Feasts." There it, with the other two feasts of harvest and ingathering, was based on a Canaanitish foundation. But the real ground for such a decision proves to be a pure conjecture. And to minimize its importance, Ezekiel is said not to have included it among his feasts. Its origin is attributed to the fact that there is such a variety of times dependent on different altitudes in Palestine when the beginning of harvest is to be celebrated, that gradually there arose the independent harvest festival called "Pentecost."

"Leprosy" is treated by a specialist, and in a way to be helpful to the Bible student. He takes up with thoroughness the question of house and garment leprosy and presents modern explanations for them. The treatment of "true leprosy," while scientific, is clear and plain, as touching both ancient and modern cases of the disease. He cannot discuss every case in the Old and New Testament, but does in a general way classify them.

"Medicine" is an interesting collection of the primitive biblical approaches to what we today call "medicine." It brings to the front such cases as salting the new-born babe (Ezek. 16:4), Joram's healing (2 Kings 8:29) after the battle of Ramoth-gilead, the sunstroke of the Shunammite's son (2 Kings 4:18-35), and the killing of the poisonous effect of herbs (2 Kings 4:41). With the priests was lodged power to determine cases of leprosy and to dispose of them. The therapeutic methods were very primitive, but sometimes effective. The sanitary provisions of those days, both for the person and his habitation, added greatly to the health and longevity of the ancient Hebrews. Such specifications observed averted many of the ills which call for the most skilful medical treatment of this day.

"Magic" is written by two authors. T. W. Davies takes up the Old and New Testament terms and discusses each individually, while Zimmern presents the place of "magic" in the Babylonian religion. There is ample reference to the chief literature on the subject, and the discussions are as full as the amount of space will permit. The views presented are in the main based on sound evidence, and give the reader a reasonable idea of what ancient magic purported to be.

Old Testament Introduction.—"Leviticus" and "Numbers" are by

Professor George F. Moore, who has also the articles on Genesis, Exodus, and Deuteronomy in the previous volumes. In the treatment of both these books a careful and exhaustive analysis of the material is given, with occasional textual notes and emendations. In general, the accepted critical views regarding the structure of the books are maintained and enforced. Special attention is given to the phenomena presented by the Holiness law of Leviticus, which is regarded as only a fragment of a more complete code. The arguments to prove that other fragments of this code are to be identified in various parts of the Hexateuch are not considered cogent. The laws in H were gathered presumably from various sources in different priestly families or guilds. Yet an impression of unity is made by the work in the present form (against Baentsch, who holds H to be the work of three or more hands). The character of the section shows its affinity with the literature of the close of the seventh and the sixth century—Deuteronomy, Jeremiah and particularly Ezekiel. The dependence of H on Deuteronomy is, however, denied. But the literary connection with Ezekiel is indubitable, though Graf's conjecture of the prophet's authorship of H is untenable. Ezekiel judges by a standard similar to H and shares with it many words and phrases. His use, not only of laws found in that code, but as well of their hortatory setting, indicates his indebtedness to it for both. Yet the new features added by Ezekiel prove that his place is later than H, which may therefore be assigned to a half century earlier. The total difference of H in tone and atmosphere from P and its closer resemblance to JE and D are also pointed out. Leviticus as a whole is not to be regarded as the work of P, but of the later editor whose hand also appears in the construction of Exodus and Numbers. Numbers, closely related to Leviticus in point of view, differs from it in combining, like Exodus, history and legislation. The method of combining JE and P and the nature of the redaction are similar to those in Exodus. J and E were united by a redactor who harmonized them when necessary. Subsequently JE was united with the parallel history of P. Yet the hypothesis of simple composition, JE united with a priestly code containing the P history and priestly laws, cannot explain the phenomena of Numbers. Much of the material contained in the book came from different hands and periods.

"Proverbs," by Professor C. H. Toy, of Harvard, is a discriminating discussion of the title, canonicity, text, and versions, form, authorship, date, process of formation, related literature, and bibliography of the book. It is impossible, he thinks, to regard Solomon as in any

sense the author. We cannot even trust to such a title as 25:1. Solomon no doubt had the reputation of being a wise man, but for what reason we have no knowledge. The only criteria for a judgment regarding date and authorship are offered by (a) the conception of life presented by the book, (b) the social conditions of the age, (c) the ethical ideas, (d) religious beliefs, (e) the relation of Proverbs to other books, and (f) linguistic peculiarities. These all point to the Greek period, not only for the date of the final literary form, but for most of the materials. The proverbs have the form and character of products of the schools, not of popular utterance. The personification of wisdom is a convincing mark of late date.

"Lamentations" is by Cheyne, with unimportant portions preserved from W. R. Smith's article in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*. The five poems are considered as to form and age. Chaps. 1, 2, and 4 are dirges, late in their present form, but perhaps preserving imbedded phrases of earlier elegies. Chap. 5 belongs to Nehemiah's age, though before the actual work of the governor began. Zion is still desolate, but the deliverer is at hand. The writer is a member of the strict religious party. It is the earliest and poorest of the poems, but cannot be regarded as earlier than 470-450 B. C. Parallels with the second and third Isaiah (*i. e.*, 56-66), and Job are pointed out. Chaps. 2 and 4 are twin poems belonging to the late Persian period. Similar parallels with the late literature are noted. The king in 4:20 is not Josiah, as those who contend for a Jeremian authorship maintain, but Zedekiah, who is only a symbol of the Davidic dynasty. Chap. 1 is slightly later still. Chap. 3 shows close resemblance to Ps. 119 and other liturgical psalms. It belongs to the pre-Maccabean portion of the Greek age. The relation of Jeremiah to any portion of Lamentation is not to be considered, and the traditions to this effect arose out of misuse of an uncritical text. The latter is here fully revised.

The article on "Micah" presents in one section the critical views up to 1883, representing W. R. Smith's opinion of the book, and giving prominence to the work of Ewald, Roorda, and Kuenen. Cheyne in the remainder of the article brings this criticism up to date, but lays emphasis upon the work of Wellhausen and Stade. König's treatment of Micah, chaps. 4 ff., is regarded as too conservative, and Driver is even more cautious. The conclusion is that in no part of chaps. 4-7 is Micah's hand to be detected. Chaps. 1-3 are "mostly genuine." The leading sections of chaps. 4-7 are by "some post-exilic writer, who, looking back on the Babylonian invasion, described in the style

of prediction how the north-Arabian peoples came against Jerusalem and carried away some of its inhabitants." Another writer, devoted to the messianic hope, inserted 5 : 1-3. A still further hand appears in 2 : 12 f. and 4 : 6 f.

"Malachi" is treated by Professor Torrey of Yale, upon the basis of W. R. Smith's earlier article. The name is not that of the writer, but is borrowed from 3 : 1. The date is in the Persian period, late rather than early. The nearest parallels are found in the Psalter and the Wisdom literature. The position of the book at the end of the canon affords a slight hint as to its lateness. It may be assigned to the first half of the fourth century. The judgment of the book as an example of the degeneracy of the Hebrew prophecy is pronounced unjust.

The several articles on various classes of Old Testament literature, although necessarily involving consideration of many topics treated also in connection with the articles on the various books, constitute an excellent feature of this work, since an opportunity is thus given to present the larger aspects and more general characteristics of the kinds of literature in question. The distribution of space seems, however, somewhat disproportionate, "Prophetic Literature" receiving twenty-two pages, while "Law Literature" is given only seven pages, and "Poetical Literature" only five. The importance of these latter topics and the treatment accorded them are such as to make us wish that it had been possible to give their writers larger opportunity.

The article "Law Literature," by G. Buchanan Gray, discusses briefly the Jewish theory concerning the origin of all law, the evidence for the existence of written laws in early times, the reasons for committing them to writing, and the new necessity of circulating the law among the people which arose with the introduction of Deuteronomy. The larger part of the article consists of a review of the historical development of the law literature through the six periods. The critical point of view is practically that represented by the Oxford *Hexateuch*. Deuteronomy is considered a fusion of two different editions of the original work, each with its own historical introduction. The Law of Holiness is assigned to the exile. The Priestly Code was prepared in the early post-exilic period, probably in Babylon, but many additions were made to it after Ezra's time. Ezra's law was the Priestly Code only, and the union of the various documents into the present Hexateuch took place probably a generation or two after Ezra's day. The treatment is thoroughly good and trustworthy, though excep-

tion must be taken to the statement that subsequent to Deuteronomy "the history of law-literature is the history of the increasing supremacy of rules based on the past over the living spirit of the present" as presenting only half the truth.

The brief contributions by Paul Volz and H. Guthe to the article on "Prophetic Literature" are its saving elements. The great bulk of the article is from Professor Cheyne himself and abounds in "critical conjectures" and novel hypotheses, the acceptance of which involves the rewriting of a large part of the history of prophecy. By most daring textual emendations Professor Cheyne discovers the name Jerahmeel in such names and words as *'elôhim*, Ramah, Elijah, Micaiah, Ahijah, Carmel, Aram, Ekron, Meholah, Jordan, Gilgal, Jericho, Ephraim, Ramoth-gilead, Edom, Ammon, Chebar, Tel-Abib, Gog, Magog, Gomer, Diblaim, Jerusalem, Belial, Nineveh, Elam, Arpad, King, etc., etc. Other new and surprising statements are, *e. g.*, that Elijah, Elisha, and the "sons of the prophets" were of north-Arabian origin, the *Negeb* having been a nursery of prophets and Levites; that Ahab's wife Jezebel and the religion she practiced and Elijah opposed came not from Phœnicia, but from north Arabia; that Amos was a native, not of Tekoa, but of Kadesh-jerahmeel, and his work was all done in the *Negeb* which in his day belonged to northern Israel, the Bethel to which Amos went being located there and not in the north, while Shimron, a north-Arabian name, must be substituted for Samaria in many passages of Amos; that Hosea was a Jerahmeelite, having lived and worked in the *Negeb*; that Jonah's mission was to the capital of the Jerahmeelites, not to Nineveh; that the so-called "Scythian prophecies" of Jeremiah refer in reality to the peoples of north Arabia; that Ezekiel worked, not in Babylon, but in north Arabia; and that Isa., chaps. 40-55, originated in north Arabia. It is quite certain that north Arabia must have played a larger part in connection with Israel's history than the traditions have indicated; but this cannot be shown to be true by the methods here employed.

The excellent article on "Poetical Literature" by Bernhard Duhn confines itself almost entirely to a treatment of questions touching the external form, the spirit and contents of the material being left out of consideration; this is greatly to be regretted. The literature is classified under three periods: (1) prior to Amos, *popular or folk poetry*; (2) Amos to Ezra, *prophetic poetry*; (3) from Ezra on, *lyric and didactic poetry*. The metric system of Ley, Briggs, *et al.*, according to which only *tone-syllables* are counted, the number of unaccented syllables

being immaterial, is declared the most satisfactory. Emphasis is rightly laid upon the importance of meter for textual criticism and exegesis. By no means sufficient attention is given to the place occupied by the strophe in poetic composition. The statement that Hosea invariably uses the four-line strophe will hardly hold true (see *American Journal of Semitic Languages*, Vol. XVII, pp. 1-15). The Song of Songs is correctly classified as a drama rather than, with Budde, as a collection of wedding-songs. On this point Budde must sooner or later withdraw his opinion. Like every product of Professor Duhm's mind, this article is scholarly and stimulating.

The first section of Canon Cheyne's article on "The Book of Psalms" is a reprint of W. Robertson Smith's article in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, with a few additional notes from the editor. This serves as an "Introductory Discussion." Then follows a "Survey of Recent Criticism," in which the opinions of Kautzsch, König, Driver, J. P. Peters, Budde, Duhm, Kirkpatrick, Wildeboer, Wellhausen, and W. Robertson Smith concerning the Psalter come under review. The final section, "Fresh Survey of Psalter," contains the author's own views. Here again the north-Arabian theory comes largely into play. A long list is given of new explanations of psalm-titles, and another list of sixteen emended historical references in the psalm-titles, the explanations and emendations proceeding from the theory that these titles are full of names which are corruptions of Jerahmeel and other north-Arabian names; "of David," *e. g.*, represents an original "of Jedithun," and "Songs of degrees" is corrupted from "Songs of Salmah," the name of a north-Arabian clan. All the divisions of the singers are declared to bear clan-names of north-Arabian or south-Palestinian origin. The historical background of many psalms is found in connection with north-Arabian hostilities, *e. g.*, 35, 42, 43, 44, 60, 74, 77, 83, 120, 137, 2, 18, 20, 21, 61, 63, 45, 72, 101, 16, 17, 49, 73. The existence of pre-exilic psalms or ascertainable fragments of such in the Psalter is denied. Books 1-3 are assigned to the Persian period, or to the end of the Persian and the beginning of the Greek period, while Books 4 and 5 are ascribed to the Greek period. Canon Cheyne's work is, as always, replete with learning and originality, but the inclusion of such hypotheses as appear in these articles is of very doubtful expediency in a work intended for the use of the general public.

The article upon Maccabees is admirable, both in method and in contents. As regards 1 Maccabees, Professor Torrey presents no

novelty, but holds to the integrity of the book as it now stands, including even chapters 14-16. Both it and the work of Jason used in 2 Maccabees he regards as coming from contemporaries of the events described. The letters with which 2 Maccabees begins, he believes were prefixed by the epitomist to his larger work.

New Testament Articles.—Jesus is the subject of three important articles, "Mary," "Messiah," and "Nativity." Little need be said concerning the first two. That upon "Mary" contains, as would be expected, an exhaustive discussion of the identification of the different persons bearing the name. Its results are perhaps as certain as are ever to be expected from any attempt to answer riddles, but naturally are of archæological rather than theological interest. The real importance of the article lies in its discussion of the paternity of Jesus, and here it is in substantial agreement with the more elaborate article upon "Nativity." The article upon "Messiah" is a thorough presentation of the main facts at our disposal. It is, however, singularly conventional in its treatment of the later messianic hope, and quite fails to grasp the significance of the idea to Christianity. It is not sufficient to trust such a fundamental matter to cross references. At the same time it is hardly more than should be expected from the general indifference shown in the entire dictionary to sound historical, as distinct from subjective philological, method. In the article by Professor Usener upon the "Nativity" we have probably the strongest possible presentation of the argument against the historicity of the so-called infancy sections of Matthew and Luke. Its essential positions are these: The accounts are the outgrowth of the doctrinal development of the post-apostolic church. The early Christians had no belief in the miraculous birth, as is shown (according to the author) by the two genealogies, both of which are based upon the supposition that Jesus was the true son of Joseph, by the Lukan account of the temple episode, by the Christologies of Acts, and by the silence of the New Testament as to the matter. Bethlehem was made the birth place from purely dogmatic reasons, Jesus being actually born in Nazareth. Luke 1: 34, 35 is an interpolation of Jewish origin, while the Matthean story as a whole came from Græco-Roman sources. In support of these positions the various data—and absence of data—of the New Testament and the early Fathers are treated at length.

Canon Robinson writes on "Presbyter" and "Prophetic Literature (New Testament)." In the former he traces the steps of the process by which "the elder brethren" became the official, or semi-official,

"elders" of the churches. It is pointed out how subordinate was the position of the presbyterial organization during the period within which Paul wrote his great doctrinal epistles. "The church, as a whole in each place had alike full powers and full responsibility for the exercise of its powers." The second article reviews the conception of prophecy in the New Testament and in the early church, concluding that "the institution of prophecy contained the elements of its own dissolution." The rivalry between irresponsible prophets and the constituted authorities could only result in the victory of the latter. "Irregularity was destined to give way to regularity, and the ministry of enthusiasm yielded to the ministry of office."

In his article of twenty-five pages on "Ministry," Professor Schmiedel traverses the period from the life of Jesus to 180 A. D. He starts with the idea that Jesus did not intend to found a separate religious community, but was a consistent adherent of the law. The sayings about the establishing of a "church" in Matthew are spurious, and Jesus instituted neither baptism nor the Lord's Supper. Only after his death were the conditions favorable to the production of institutions. As belief in his Messiahship and resurrection developed, it supplied the motives to institutional church-building. On the question of the relation of "elder" and "bishop," Schmiedel pronounces confidently for their identity.

The "Lord's Day" is briefly treated by Professor Deissmann, who discusses the few relevant New Testament notices, the allusion to a fixed day of Christian worship in Pliny's letter to Trajan (*ca.* 112 A. D.), and the references in Justin Martyr. The author thinks that while the beginnings of Sunday observance are obscure, it is probable that the post-apostolic usage was based on apostolic custom. Though the Græco-Roman nomenclature which named the days after the planets was in use (as by Justin and Tertullian), the early church preferred the designations "first day," "eighth day," or "Lord's day," that is, the day of the Lord's resurrection.

Professor Adolf Jülicher writes the succinct article on "Logos." The principal facts are stated. There is no peculiarity in the New Testament use of the term "Logos" except in the fourth gospel. There it is used as a name for the eternally pre-existing Christ who was with God and was God. Thus from John 1:1 ff. we may define the Logos as a divine being, yet still sharply distinguished from God—so that monotheism is not directly denied nor equal to the Father, yet endowed with all divine powers whereby to bring to pass the will

of God concerning the universe." On the origin of the Logos-idea in the fourth gospel the author maintains that it is borrowed from Philo, but adapted with great skill by the writer to the purposes of his Christian philosophy. This identification of Christ with the Logos of Philonic speculation made its contribution to the development of the metaphysics of Deity which culminated in the Nicene period.

The longest New Testament article (seventeen pages) is on "Paul ;" the first half is by Dr. Edwin Hatch, reproduced from the *Encyclopædia Britannica*; the second half is by Professor W. C. van Manen, of the University of Leiden. Hatch's biographical article on Paul was a scholarly piece of work, and still has great value, although the history of the apostolic age and of Paul is now much more fully and clearly understood than it was fifteen years ago. Had the supplemental portion been written by a representative scholar of England or Germany, this composite article on Paul might have been counted first-class, although it would have been inconvenient to use because not unified.² But Professor Cheyne's peculiar notions of New Testament literature led him to invite as author for this portion a Dutch scholar of most extravagant and improbable views about Paul. The result is that the last half of the article gives, not what sound scholarship holds concerning Paul and his epistles, but what is almost universally pronounced an untenable reconstruction of the New Testament history. Admitting that Paul, a Jew, and later a Christian disciple, lived and worked in the first generation of Christianity, he denies that any of the canonical epistles were written by him, or that these epistles and the book of Acts give trustworthy knowledge concerning him ; so that the real character, ideas, and work of Paul are practically unknown to us.

In the same drastic manner Professor van Manen deals with the subject of the New Testament canon in the article on "Old-Christian Literature."³ He says that the distinction between canonical and non-canonical Christian writings must be abandoned ; the study of the New Testament books and of the patristic writings must be amalgamated. This is maintained for two reasons : (1) because the dates at

² The more one uses the *Encyclopædia Biblica*, the stronger becomes one's conviction that it was a grand mistake in the planning of the work to adopt the composite plan, incorporating matter from the *Encyclopædia Britannica* (which was ten to twenty years old) and supplementing it. All the articles should have been written entirely anew.

³ There is no excuse for introducing into English this imitation of the technical German phrase, "altchristliche Litteratur." We already have the term "Early Christian Literature," which means the same.

present accepted for the New Testament books are mostly wrong, as they belong in the main to the second century; (2) because there is nothing in the origin, the ideas, or the value of the New Testament books that distinguishes them from the second century Christian writings. Certainly, if these two things are so, there is no reason for classifying or studying the New Testament books as a special group. But neither of these allegations is true, according to the consensus of all sane scholarly opinion. The article is one of the most unsatisfactory treatments of its subject that can be found anywhere in print; it accomplishes very little, even toward the presentation of its own point of view.

The article upon the "Petrine Epistles" is by Professor Orello Cone, whose radical views are well known. Neither of the epistles had any connection with the apostle Peter, direct or indirect. They are both post-apostolic in time. The first is "deutero-Pauline," marking a transition from Paulinism to the Fourth Gospel; the second belongs to the last half of the second century. After reading such an article one returns with renewed thankfulness to Dr. Chase's able and moderate discussion of these two epistles in the Hastings *Dictionary of the Bible*.

Professor Nestle contributes the article upon the "Lord's Prayer," treating with minuteness the problem of its form and meaning, dwelling particularly upon its relations to rabbinical literature, and giving patristic testimony concerning the prayer. It is a linguistic study of the prayer that is given; and this does not carry us very far toward understanding it, for we should have a study of its ideas in relation to the whole teaching of Jesus, and an exposition of its value and use as presenting the essence of the gospel taught by him. The two-page article by Professor Jülicher on "Parables" sets forth as fully as the cramped space permits the admirable method of interpreting the parables which has been previously presented in his great work, *Die Gleichnisreden Jesu* (1899). "They bear unmistakable evidence of genuineness, and thus tell us with no uncertain voice what lay nearest to the very heart of Jesus."

Through Science to Faith. By REV. NEWMAN SMYTH, D.D. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1902. Pp. 289. \$1.50, net.

Since Kant's merciless criticism of the traditional arguments of natural theology, this phase of theological speculation has been somewhat discredited. It needed only the rise of the doctrine of evolution to complete the collapse of theistic arguments, based on the presump-